

Language is Physical

Paul Benioff

Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory

Argonne, IL 60439

e-mail: pbenioff@anl.gov

February 1, 2008

Abstract

Some aspects of the physical nature of language are discussed. In particular, physical models of language must exist that are efficiently implementable. The existence requirement is essential because without physical models no communication or thinking would be possible. Efficient implementability for creating and reading language expressions is discussed and illustrated with a quantum mechanical model. The reason for interest in language is that language expressions can have meaning, either as an informal language or as a formal language associated with mathematical or physical theories. It is noted that any universally applicable physical theory, or coherent theory of physics and mathematics together, includes in its domain physical models of expressions for both the informal language used to discuss the theory and the expressions of the theory itself. It follows that there must be some formulas in the formal theory that express some of their own physical properties. The inclusion of intelligent systems in the domain of the theory means that the theory, e.g. quantum mechanics, must describe, in some sense, its own validation. Maps of language expressions into physical states are discussed. A spin projection example is discussed as are conditions under which such a map is a Gödel map. The possibility that language is also mathematical is very briefly discussed.

1 Introduction

Quantum computation and quantum information are areas of much interest and research activity. The work began in 1980 -1982 [1] with the description of Hamiltonian models of Turing machines in which the information bearing degrees of freedom only were described quantum mechanically. Since these models did not dissipate energy the work showed that the time energy uncertainty principle did not necessitate energy dissipation. Instead this principle relates the speed of a computation to the energy and energy dispersion of the system being studied [2, 3].

Other work in the 1980s first suggested that computers operating quantum mechanically might be able to simulate physical systems much more efficiently than classical computers [4]. In 1985 and 1989 the early models of quantum computation were expanded and generalized to the models based on networks of quantum gates and quantum Turing machines that are in wide use today as the basis for study of quantum computation and quantum information [5, 6].

An essential component of quantum computation and quantum information theory is the representation of numbers and information by quantum states. For example the state $|10010\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^5 |s(j), j\rangle = |s\rangle$ where j is the physical parameter denoting the place label and $s(1) = 0, \dots, s(5) = 1$ is a binary representation of a number. Other representations of the number are $\sum_{j=1}^5 2^{j-1} s(j)$ and 18 in the decimal representation. Linear superpositions of number states

such as $\psi = \sum_s c_s |s\rangle$ where the sum is over all 2^n functions s with domain $1, \dots, n$ and range $\{0, 1\}$ play a very important role in quantum computation.

Quantum information theory is based on the use of these states to also represent multiqubit states. A qubit, which is the basic unit of quantum information theory, is represented by a binary state $\phi = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ where $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. Multiqubit states can be written as products of states of the form of ϕ or more generally as ψ given above.

A fundamental property of these qubit states is the fact that information is physical. This point, which was emphasized by Landauer [7], states that all states representing information must have a physical basis. That is, information is necessarily represented by states of physical systems. An example often used is the representation of a qubit by the spin projection states of a spin 1/2 system. If a physical representation were not possible, quantum information theory would not have any connection or relevance to physics.

A similar situation holds for numbers, i.e. numbers are physical. This requirement means that numbers must be represented by states of physical systems. This applies to natural numbers, integers, and rational numbers¹.

One good way to characterize these different types of numbers is by the set of axioms for each type of numbers. The natural numbers are described by the axioms of number theory or arithmetic, the integers and rational numbers by the respective axioms for a commutative ring with identity and a field (a ring with a multiplicative inverse) [8].

The requirement that numbers are physical means that there must exist physical systems with states such that the operations and relations defined by the axioms are physically implementable and that the physical implementations of the operations and relations are efficient. This requirement of efficient implementability for an operation means that there must exist an actual physical procedure for carrying out the operation, and the space-time and thermodynamic resources required to carry out the procedure

must be polynomial in the length of the numeral strings used to represent the numbers. In particular the resources required cannot be exponential in the string lengths.

Physical representations and the requirement of efficient implementability for quantum systems have been discussed in more detail elsewhere for the natural numbers, integers, and rational numbers [9, 10]. There it was noted that the requirement of efficient implementability necessitates the use of k -ary representations of numbers as the amount of information that can be contained and manipulated in a given space time volume is limited [11]. Also, for arithmetic, the requirement of efficient implementability necessitates the introduction of many successor operations, one for each j corresponding to the addition of k^{j-1} , and axioms describing their properties. The reason is that the axioms of arithmetic describe just one successor, corresponding to addition of 1, and the properties of the $+$ and $\times$ operations. The problem is that any procedure that adds or multiplies two numbers and is based on just the one successor operation is not efficient as it requires exponentially many iterations of the successor. In [10] these arguments were also seen to apply to representations of $+$ and $\times$ on states representing the integers and rational numbers.

In this paper these arguments are extended to representations of languages in quantum mechanics. That is, *language is physical*. This condition has two aspects: One is that physical models of language must exist and the other is that the physical models must be efficiently implementable. These are discussed in the next section where a specific model is summarized to illustrate efficient implementability.

Probably the most important aspect of physical representations of language is that language can have meaning. This is the case if the language is a formal language of a physical or mathematical theory, or is informal as a metalanguage used to discuss physical and mathematical theories in general. An example of the latter is the language used in this and other papers. Physical states, interpreted as expressions in an informal language or a formal language of a (consistent) theory, have meaning in that they describe properties of other systems (physical or mathematical) or even of themselves in a physical theory of

¹Real and complex numbers, as limits of sequences of rational numbers, must be represented differently.

sufficiently inclusive applicability.

This is discussed more in Section 3 where physical and mathematical theories in general are considered. Included is a discussion of universal applicability of a physical theory and the need for a coherent theory of mathematics and physics together that treats mathematics and physics together rather than as two entirely separate fields.

The long term goal is to develop a coherent theory of physics and mathematics together. At present this is just a dream [12]. However there are various aspects of interest that can be said about this. The above suggests the importance to such a theory, or to any universally applicable physical theory, of maps of language expressions into physical states. These are discussed in Section 4. An example of such a map of expressions of any language into spin projection states of spin systems located on a 3D lattice is discussed. The existence of many such maps and the conditions that such a map must satisfy if the map is to be a Gödel map are discussed. For universally applicable physical theories it is noted that the necessary physical nature of language suggest that Gödel maps may play a more limited role for these theories than for mathematical theories.

A discussion of this is given in the last section. Included is the point that if language is mathematical, then conclusions similar to those reached for physical theories would apply to mathematical theories. The observation that it seems unlikely that language is mathematical in the same immediate and necessary sense that it is physical is discussed. It is noted that one should keep an open mind on this question and that more work is needed.

2 Language is Physical

As noted in the introduction, the condition that language is physical means that physical models of language must exist and that the physical models must be efficiently implementable. That physical models must exist is quite evident. Without such models, communication would be impossible. Examples of such models include written text, speech, and optical transmission of language expressions (just as

speech is transmission of language expressions by sound waves in air). Specific models of written text, as distributions of ink molecules in a 3D lattice of potential wells, or spin projection states of systems in the same lattice, are discussed elsewhere [13].

It is also quite likely that the ability to think or reason depends on the existence of physical models of language. Without entering into details of this complex subject it seems reasonable to expect that distinct conscious states of the brain correspond to distinct physical states of the brain. This would be expected to be the case independent of how one reasons or thinks (e.g. in picture sequences or word sequences, etc.). If such physical states did not exist, then it is likely that reasoning, thinking and even consciousness would not be possible [14, 15, 16, 17]. That is, physical representations of language are a necessary, but probably not sufficient, condition for the existence of communication, thinking, and possibly even consciousness.

It should be noted that here language is being given a very general definition in that it consists of sets of words with the words in each set ordered into a sequence by their positions in space-time. Such an ordered sequence of words is referred to here as an expression. Individual words can take many forms, such as strings of alphabet symbols, pictures, or signs (as in sign language for the deaf).

The terminology used here is based on the set $\mathcal{A}^*$ of all finite strings of symbols in a finite alphabet $\mathcal{A}$. A particular symbol, $\#$, in $\mathcal{A}$ is singled out to represent a spacer symbol. An expression is any string in $\mathcal{A}^*$. An expression is a word or formula if it does not contain $\#$. A string of words is an expression with words separated by one or more spacer symbols.

Efficient implementability of physical models of a language means that physical states representing expressions (expression states) must be efficiently creatable and readable. Also operations on the states that generate new expression states or linear superpositions of such must be efficiently implementable.

In general efficient implementability of a procedure means that there must exist a physically implementable dynamics for the procedure and the dynamics, represented by a unitary $U(t) = e^{-iHt}$, must be efficient. That is, the space-time and thermodynamic

resources needed to carry out the procedure must be polynomial in the expression length. In particular it should not be exponential.

An example to illustrate the meaning of efficient implementability consists of a multistate head M moving on a $1D$ lattice of potential wells. Each well is occupied by one system with k internal states corresponding to an alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ of k symbols. Under the action of a unitary dynamics, $U_M(t)$, M interacts locally with the systems and can move in either direction.

Expression states have the form

$$|X, [a, b]\rangle = \otimes_{j=a}^b |X(j), j\rangle \quad (1)$$

where $X(j) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $[a, b]$ is an interval on the lattice. The Heisenberg representation projection operator for the state $|X, [a, b]\rangle$ at time t is given by

$$P_{X,[a,b]}(t) = U_M^\dagger(t) P_{X,[a,b]} U_M(t). \quad (2)$$

Consider an initial state $\Psi = |\#, i, 0\rangle$ consisting of all lattice systems in the spacer symbol $\#$ state and M in state internal state i and at position 0. Efficient creation of expression states means that for each $X, [a, b]$ the creation probability must be asymptotically stable. In other words, the limit

$$\langle \Psi | P_{X,[a,b]}(\infty) | \Psi \rangle = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Psi | P_{X,[a,b]}(t) | \Psi \rangle \quad (3)$$

must exist for each $X, [a, b]$.

Efficient creation also means that the limit must be approached efficiently. The meaning of this is based on the definition of a limit:

$$\forall m \exists \tau \forall t, t' > \tau \\ |\langle \Psi | P_{X,[a,b]}(t) | \Psi \rangle - \langle \Psi | P_{X,[a,b]}(t') | \Psi \rangle| < 2^{-m}.$$

This states the existence, for each error bound, of a $\tau = \tau(X, m, a, n)$ which is a lower bound for all times t, t' satisfying the inequality above. The dependence of τ on all the parameters, where n is the length $L(X)$ of X , is indicated.

Let $\tau(m, a, n) = \max_{X: L(X)=n} \tau(X, m, a, n)$. Clearly the limit definition holds with $\tau(m, a, n)$ replacing $\tau(X, m, a, n)$. The requirement of efficient

creation means that the n dependence of $\tau(m, a, n)$ must satisfy

$$\tau(m, a, n) = K_{m,a} n^\ell. \quad (4)$$

In particular $\tau(m, a, n)$ must not have an exponential dependence on n or $\tau(m, a, n) \neq C_{m,a} 2^{n^\nu}$. Here the m and a dependence is included in the constants $K_{m,a}, C_{m,a}$. Typically the polynomial and exponential exponents $\ell \sim 1 - 3$ and $\nu \sim 1$. Factors of $\log n$ have been ignored in the above.

This states explicitly that for each m , the time needed for the probability of creating an expression at a given lattice point to be within 2^{-m} of a limit probability, has a polynomial dependence on the length of the expression. That is, the time resources needed to create an expression at a given lattice point with some probability p have a polynomial dependence on the length of the expression.

Note that this says nothing about the dependence of the time resources needed on either the accuracy or value of m or on the lattice position a . For example it could be that $K_{m,a}$ in Eq. 4 has an exponential dependence on m or $K_{m,a} = k_a 2^m$.

The above example refers to efficient creation of an expression state. The same considerations apply to any operation that involves reading an expression state. In particular reading rules for expressions that are used are very simple and minimize the energy and momentum resources required to read an expression. An example of such a rule is the motion of a head M along a straight line path in a $2D$ or $3D$ lattice to read an expression state $|X, [a, b]\rangle$. Carrying this out expends energy and momentum at a rate that is polynomial in the length n of X where the polynomial exponent is ~ 1 .

The point of this is to emphasize that such simple reading rules, which are universally used, are the exception in that almost all reading rules are much more complex and require much more space time and thermodynamic resources to implement. To see this consider that an expression state $|X, [a, b]\rangle = \otimes_{j=a}^b |X(j), j\rangle$ is a special case of a state $|X, p\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^n |X(j), p(j)\rangle$ where p is a function from the positive integers to the points on the lattice and n is the length of X . Clearly any reading rule based on a general p has M moving on the lattice in many different

directions, from $p(j)$ to $p(j+1)$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots$, and expending much more energy and momentum in the process.

The reading rule can be even more complex in that the location of the lattice chosen for the $j+1$ st symbol of X can depend on the first j symbols read in X . In this case $|X, p\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^n |X(j), p(X_{[1,j-1]}, j)\rangle$. Here $X_{[1,j-1]}$ denotes the first $j-1$ symbols of X and p is a function from $N \times \mathcal{A}^*$ to the lattice. In this case it would be exponentially hard for a head M to use rule p to read $|X, p\rangle$. These arguments show clearly why simple reading rules are universally used even though these rules are in the minority as most rules are not simple.

So far the discussion about efficient implementability is not unique to language as it applies also to $k-ary$ representations of numbers. The interest in language representations is based on the observation that language expressions can have meaning. This is the case for language expressions as formulas, words, and word strings in physical and mathematical theories and as expressions in the informal language used to describe theories and other aspects of existence.

This aspect is the basis for interest in the condition that language is physical, and in physical and mathematical theories in general. Some relevant aspects of these theories are discussed in the next section.

3 Physical and Mathematical Theories

Here the interest is in theories that are first order axiomatizable. These are theories based on axiom sets for which the range of variables is limited to individuals in a model domain. It does not also include sets of individuals as in second order logic [18]. The limitation to first order theories is made because most studies in mathematical logic are concerned with first order theories.

Mathematical logic is the study of various axiomatizable mathematical theories and the relationship between such concepts as truth, validity, consistency, completeness and provability. Here the interest is in extending these concepts to physical theories. (See

[19] for a very simple example of such an extension.) For the purposes of this paper the details of specific sets of axioms are not relevant.

Here interest is in those language expression states, such as $|X, [a, b]\rangle$ that are formula states (or word states), term states, or expression states representing strings of formulas in languages of physical and mathematical theories. In this case, by Gödel's completeness theorem [20], the formula states have meaning if and only if the theory being considered is consistent.

In this case the formulas² acquire meaning through an interpretation into a domain of applicability of the theory. An interpretation I is a map of the symbols (or symbol strings if needed) for constants, variables, operations or functions, and relations of the theory language into elements, variables, basic operations or functions, and basic relations in a structure. In this way variable free terms are mapped into elements, terms with variables are mapped into functions, and formulas are mapped into relations in the structure. The structure or domain of applicability of the theory is a model of the theory if all the axioms of the theory are true for the map I . For a given theory there are many different models each with its associated map I . Some of these models are isomorphic to one another and (for first order theories) others are not. Additional details are given in [20].

Here the interest is in physical theories that are universally applicable. Quantum mechanics, or some suitable generalization such as quantum field theory, is an example of such a theory. It is not known at present how to define universal applicability or even if this concept is useful. One problem with a simple definition that states that the theory is applicable to all physical systems, with no restrictions on what one means by "all", is that, according to Tegmark [21], it leads to acceptance of the Everett Wheeler interpretation of quantum mechanics. This follows logically from the two statements: "All isolated systems are described by the Schrödinger equation in quantum mechanics", "The universe is an isolated system" [21].

For the purposes of this paper it is sufficient to

²From now the explicit reference to "states" for states representing formulas, terms, etc., will be suppressed.

require that the domain of applicability include intelligent beings as systems occupying a finite region of space-time. Also included are physical systems with states that can represent language. That is, the states must be such that creating and reading expression states, and other operations on expression states, must be efficiently implementable. The same requirement holds for numbers in that all physical systems with states that can represent numbers of different types must be included. From here on it is assumed that however one defines universal applicability, it must satisfy these requirements.

The requirements of universal applicability of a physical theory and language is physical have the consequence that there exist physical systems with states representing language expressions, and that these systems are in a model domain of the theory. This applies to both the informal language used by an intelligent being to describe such a theory, (or any other theory) and to the formulas and theorems of the formal language of the theory. For any representation of the informal language and formal language of the theory, there must be formulas and theorems of the theory that describe the physical properties of the representations of expressions of both the informal and formal languages. In particular there must be some formulas and theorems of the theory that describe some of their own physical properties.

Note that the formulas and theorems with this self description property are different for different physical representations of the language expressions. This follows from the observation that representing expressions or text as arrangements of ink molecules on a 3D lattice of potential wells (text on printed pages) has a different physical description than representation as modulated sound waves (speech).

Since quantum mechanics is supposed to be universally applicable, the expressions, formulas and theorems of any theory are represented by states of quantum systems. This applies to quantum mechanics itself as a theory in that some states of physical systems can be interpreted as describing their own physics.

It also follows from the universal applicability of quantum mechanics that intelligent systems are quantum systems. This is the case even if they are macroscopic systems of about 10^{25} degrees of free-

dom.

An important activity of intelligent quantum systems is the construction of a valid physical theory using physics and mathematics. If the theory is universally applicable then the theory being validated is the theory describing the dynamics of the systems carrying out the validation. The theory must in some sense describe its own validation. In particular quantum mechanics must, in some sense, describe its own validation.

The details of this description and what is involved are not known at present. However, as is well known, an important part of the validation process is the comparison of theoretical predictions with experimental results. The theoretical predictions, which are based on mathematical theorems and formulas in the mathematics of quantum mechanics, are determined by computations on a computer. It follows from the universality of quantum mechanics that computations are a dynamical quantum process on a quantum system, and that this process should be described within quantum mechanics³.

Similarly the experimental process, consisting of preparation of a system in some state and measuring some property of it, is a quantum dynamical process. Both the apparatus used to prepare a system in some state (if preparation is part of the measurement) and the apparatus used to measure some property of the system so prepared, are quantum systems. It follows that the dynamics of the preparation and measurement procedures are quantum dynamical procedures that should be describable within quantum mechanics just as the computation process is describable within quantum mechanics.

It must be emphasized that it follows from the universality of quantum mechanics that measurements and computational processes are a small fraction of processes in general whose dynamics are described in quantum mechanics. Most processes are meaningless and are neither experiments nor computations. And quantum mechanics itself seems to be completely silent on which processes have meaning as experiments or as computations, or are meaningless.

³It is this group of ideas that led to the authors early work on quantum mechanical models of computation.

An essential role provided by intelligent quantum systems is to determine which processes have meaning as experiments and which have meaning as computations. These systems determine which physical quantum processes are valid computations and which are valid experiments. As part of the validation process for quantum mechanics, intelligent systems also determine which computation should be compared with which experiment. Since intelligent systems are quantum systems, a goal of future work is to describe, to the maximum extent possible, the validation process itself within quantum mechanics.

As part of such a description it is to be noted that the validation process depends on the close intertwining of physics and mathematics. This suggests a need for a *coherent theory of mathematics and physics together* that describes, to the maximum extent possible, its own validity and strength and is maximally valid and strong. The universal applicability of quantum mechanics suggests that development of a coherent theory of mathematics and quantum mechanics together is needed. Such a theory should include, to the maximum extent possible, a quantum dynamical description of its own validation by quantum systems. It should also maximally describe its own validity and strength and be maximally valid and strong. (See [13] for more discussion of these ideas.)

4 Maps of Language into Physical States

It is expected that an important component of a coherent theory of physics and mathematics will consist of maps from language expressions to states of physical systems. To this end some very simple aspects of maps from language expressions to states of physical systems will be examined in this section. In particular the interest is in maps from the expressions of any language, formal or informal, to states of quantum systems. The states can be macroscopic, as in the case of computers used so far, or they can be microscopic, as in models of quantum computation.

A simple example of a map G to microscopic physical states can be described for quantum spin systems

of spin s located on a $3D$ lattice $\mathcal{L}$ of space points $\underline{x} = x, y, z$. The spin s is such that $2s + 1 \geq |\mathcal{A}|$, the number of symbols in the language alphabet $\mathcal{A}$. The map G from expressions can be defined from two $1 - 1$ maps $g : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \{|m\rangle : -s \leq m \leq s\}$ and $p : N \rightarrow \{|\underline{x}\rangle : \underline{x} \in \mathcal{L}\}$. Here g maps the alphabet to single system spin projection states, p is a map from the natural numbers to space point states on the lattice $\mathcal{L}$, and $\mathcal{A}^*$ is the set of all expressions as finite length strings of symbols in $\mathcal{A}$.

The map G is defined by the pair (g, p) such that

$$G(X) = \otimes_{j=1}^{|X|} |g(X(j)), p(j)\rangle. \quad (5)$$

Here X , as a symbol string, is a function from $1, 2, \dots, |X|$ to $\mathcal{A}$, $|X|$ is the number of symbols in X , and $|g(X(j)), p(j)\rangle = |g(X(j))\rangle \times |p(j)\rangle$ is the state of a spin system at site $p(j)$. p represents the path in $\mathcal{L}$ along which the spin systems are located. The ordering of the symbols in X into a symbol string and the ordering of the spin states along p is based on the canonical well ordering of the natural numbers in N .

Several features of G should be noted. There are a great many maps G from the expressions in $\mathcal{A}^*$ to states of quantum mechanical systems. Besides the existence of many different maps p , the map g can change in many ways. For example, let u be any unitary operator on the $|\mathcal{A}|$ dimensional Hilbert space of each spin system and define $g_u = ug$. This defines a new map G_u according to $G_u(X) = \otimes_{j=1}^{|X|} |u(g(X(j))), p(j)\rangle$.

Other possibilities for g include maps of alphabet symbols into entangled spin states of several quantum spin systems. This type of map is useful in quantum error correction schemes [22]. One can also let $u = u_{\underline{x}}$ depend on the lattice locations. This type of map is similar to the local gauge transformations used in quantum field theory.

Also g can map the alphabet to quite different types of microscopic states of quantum systems. g can also map the alphabet to macroscopic states of systems. An example describes symbols A in $\mathcal{A}$ as particular arrangements of ink molecules in a lattice of potential wells, one molecule per well. To each alphabet symbol A is associated a density operator state ρ_A characterized by a lattice location parameter

and scale parameters to determine the size and shape of A . Additional details are given elsewhere [13].

The above discussion might lead one to believe that any map G from language expressions to physical states is acceptable. This is not the case as G does have some restrictions. It should be such that the syntactic operations, including creating and reading the states $G(X)$ (denoted as $|X, [1, |X|]\rangle$), are efficiently implementable. This point has already been discussed in Section 2.

The definition of G in Eq. 5 is independent of which expressions in $\mathcal{A}^*$ correspond to words, formulas, or theorems in a theory. It applies to any language of any theory based on the alphabet $\mathcal{A}$. The language can be that of a consistent or an inconsistent theory, or it can be informal such as the language used to write this paper.

Note that the definition of G maps expressions directly into physical system states without first mapping expressions into multiqubit states and then mapping multiqubit states into states of physical systems. The advantage of proceeding through states of qubits as units of quantum information with n basis states is that qubits provide a good quantum mechanical reference point. One can then consider mappings from qubit states to states of different physical systems. This is what is done in quantum computation work where the expressions are strings of numerals, usually in the binary basis. Here this two step mapping is not used as it is not needed. It is more economical to proceed directly from expressions in $\mathcal{A}^*$ to states of physical systems.

As defined G is a map from the expressions of any language into the physical states of quantum systems. It is of interest to restrict G to the case that the language is associated with a consistent theory and the physical states are part of a model universe or domain of applicability for the theory. Then G maps expressions corresponding to terms, formulas, and strings of formulas to states of quantum systems in a domain or model of the theory. In this case G is an example of a Gödel map. These maps can be used to interpret formulas of the language as describing some of their own properties.

In general a Gödel map G is a $1 - 1$ map of the expressions of a theory language into individual ele-

ments of any model for the theory. By use of such a map formulas that describe properties of the elements of the model under I can be interpreted through G to describe syntactic properties of the language expressions. The canonical example, which was first used by Gödel to prove incompleteness theorems for arithmetic [23], is a map from the expressions of the language of arithmetic to the set of natural numbers. In this way arithmetic formulas, which describe properties of numbers, can be interpreted to describe properties of the language expressions themselves [24, 20].

The concept of a Gödel map can be extended to any physical or mathematical theory, not just arithmetic. For quantum mechanics a map G would be a map from expressions in the language of quantum mechanics to states of quantum systems that are included in a model of a theory of quantum mechanics. In this way some formulas in the language of quantum mechanics that describe properties of quantum systems can be interpreted through G to describe some of their own properties.

It is not necessary that the individual model elements be states of quantum systems. They can be other quantum objects such as operators or modes of quantum fields. These may be useful for constructing quantum mechanical models of the theories or real and complex numbers.

Additional aspects of these maps and their relation to interpretations of theories will be left to future work. Here it is sufficient to note that for a universally applicable theory such as quantum mechanics, it follows from the observation that language is physical that any expression of any language for quantum mechanics is already a physical state of systems in the domain of the theory. In this case one would expect Gödel maps to have a different character than for the case where the theory is not about quantum systems. An example of this would be the case where the theory is arithmetic which is about numbers and not about quantum systems. More details about these aspects will be addressed in future work.

5 Discussion

It is of interest to ask if Gödel maps provide the same function for mathematical theories as for universally applicable physical theories. That language is physical suggests that there may be a difference. For universally applicable physical theories, all physical representations of language are necessarily already in the model domain of the theory. For any representation there are formulas that describe physical properties of the systems in the representation. In this case the role of G is limited to determining the particular correspondence $X \rightarrow G(X)$. The range set of G is already included in the space of states of physical properties of systems in the model domain. Eq. 5 is an example in which the space of physical properties is the Hilbert space spanned by the spin projection eigenstates of the lattice spin systems.

For mathematics the situation equivalent to that in physics would be the existence of a universally applicable mathematical theory and the condition that language is mathematical. That is, there must necessarily exist many mathematical representations of the language all of which are contained in a model of a universally applicable theory. It is not at all clear that this is the case.

Zermelo Frankel set theory is an example of a very powerful mathematical theory. Even though it does not include all of mathematics [25] its domain of applicability is sufficiently broad to be considered universally applicable from the viewpoint taken here. Also it includes all the mathematics used so far by physics [26]. However it is not at all clear that languages must have mathematical representations in an immediate and direct sense that it must have physical representations. As noted before in Section 2, The fact that we can communicate, e.g. by speech or writing, and can think implies the existence of physical representations of language. If these representations did not exist we could not communicate or even think.

From a mathematical point of view the existence or nonexistence of such representations is an abstract issue that has nothing to do with communication or any other basic physical or mathematical aspect. Also mathematical representations can al-

ways be constructed by use of Gödel maps. However this does not address the question whether the potential nonexistence of mathematical representations of language has any immediate and direct consequences as is the case for physical representations.

At this point it seems unlikely that language is mathematical in a same or similar sense that language is physical. However this is an open question. Further elucidation may have to await more development of a coherent theory of mathematics and physics together.

If one regards language expressions as strings of symbols in an alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ as an abstract concept in that expressions have some ideal existence outside of space and time, then the maps G link these abstract objects to states of physical systems. This is similar to the realist position in mathematics that regards mathematical objects as having an ideal or Platonic existence outside of space and time. This position, which has been much discussed in the literature [25, 27, 28], has its own set of problems. It is clear that more work needs to be done regarding the role played by the maps G linking language expressions to states of physical systems.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Nuclear Physics Division, under contract W-31-109-ENG-38.

References

- [1] P. Benioff, Jour Stat. Phys. **22**, 563 (1980); Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1581 (1998); International Jour. Theor. Phys. **21**, 177 (1982).
- [2] N. Margolus and L. B. Levitin, Physica D **120**, 188 (1998).
- [3] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, *The Role of Entanglement in Dynamical Systems*, Los Alamos Archive preprint quant-ph/0206001.
- [4] R.P. Feynman, International Jour. Theor. Phys. **21**, 467 (1982).

- [5] R. P. Feynman, Optics News **11** 11 (1985); reprinted in Foundations of Physics **16** 507 (1986).
- [6] D. Deutsch, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A, **400** 997 (1985); *ibid.*, **425** 73 (1989).
- [7] R. Landauer, Physics Today **44**, No 5, 23, (1991); Physics Letters A **217** 188, (1996); in "Feynman and Computation, Exploring the Limits of Computers", A.J.G.Hey, Ed., (Perseus Books, Reading MA, 1998).
- [8] I.T.Adamson, *Introduction to Field Theory, 2nd. Edition*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1982.
- [9] P. Benioff, Phys. Rev. A, 032305, March, 2001.
- [10] P. Benioff, Los Alamos Archives preprint quant-ph/0103078, to appear in Algorithmica, Special Issue; Phys. Rev. A **64** 0522310, (2001).
- [11] S. Lloyd, Nature, **406**, 1047 (2000).
- [12] S. Weinberg, *Dreams of a Final Theory*, (Vintage Books, New York, NY, 1994).
- [13] Foundations of Physics, **32**, 989 (2002).
- [14] H. P. Stapp, *Mind, Matter, and Quantum Mechanics*, (Springer Verlag, Berlin 1993).
- [15] E. Squires, *Conscious Mind in the Physical World* (IOP Publishing, Bristol England, 1990).
- [16] D. Page, Los Alamos Archives preprint quant-ph/0108039.
- [17] R. Penrose, *The Emperor's New Mind* (Penguin Books, New York, 1991).
- [18] J. Väänänen, Bull. Symbolic Logic, **7**, pp 504-519, (2001).
- [19] P.Benioff, Phys. Rev.A **59**, 4223 (1999); J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 5843 (2002).
- [20] J.R. Shoenfield, *Mathematical Logic*, (Addison Weseley Publishing Co.Inc., Reading, MA, 1967).
- [21] M. Tegmark, Los Alamos archives Preprint quant-ph/9709032, Published in Fortsch. Phys. **46**, 855-862 (1998).
- [22] R. Laflamme, C. Miquel, J. P. Paz, and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Letters, **77** 198 (1996); D. P. DiVincenzo and P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. Letters, **77**3260 (1996); E. M. Raines, R. H. Hardin, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane, Phys. Rev. Letters **79** 954 (1997).
- [23] K. Gödel, *Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und Vervandter Systeme I* Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik, **38**, 173-198, (1931).
- [24] R. Smullyan, *Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1992).
- [25] A. A. Frankel, Y. Bar-hillel, A. Levy, and D. van Dalen, *Foundations of Set Theory, second revised edition*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Vol 67, (North-Holland Publishing Co. Amsterdam, 1973).
- [26] P. Benioff, Jour. Math. Phys, **17**, 618, 629, (1976).
- [27] W.W Marek and J. Mycielski, Amer. Math. Monthly, **108** pp 449-468, (2001).
- [28] S. Shapiro, *Philosophy of Mathematics: Structure and Ontology*, Oxford Univ. Press, New York (1997).